

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-21 were previously pending in the instant application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 16-18 have been rejected and Claims 13-15 and 19-21 have been objected to. By way of the above amendment, Claims 1, 5, 10, 16 and 17 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-21 are still pending in this application.

Objection to Claims 1-15

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-15 have been objected to for the following informalities: Claims 1 and 5 recite “including” where they should recite “comprising”, and in Claim 10 each element is separated by a comma, where each element should be separated by a semicolon. By way of the above amendment, Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to recite “comprising” instead of “including” and Claim 10 has been amended such that each element recited is separated by a semicolon instead of a comma.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Within the Office Action, Claims 16-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, within the Office Action it is stated that Claim 16 is vague and indefinite since it contains only a preamble. By way of the above amendment Claim 16 has been amended to recite an interactive video game controller adapter for engaging with a hand-held video game controller and shaped to represent the unique characteristics of a video game, the interactive video game controller adapter being configured to manipulate control buttons on the a hand-held video game controller through input controls to manipulate images of a video game on a remote screen coupled to the hand-held video game controller. Accordingly, function and structure are now both clearly recited in the independent Claim 16.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 16-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,213,327 to Kitaue (hereafter “Kitaue”).

Specifically, within the Office Action it is stated that Kitaue teaches a video game system with an output screen, a video game controller having buttons for inputting commands to manipulate images on the output screen, video game software interfacing between the controller and the output screen and a controller adapter for engaging the controller and being configured to simulate real life activity of the video game.

Kitaue teaches a game apparatus for use with a hand-holdable video game having a controller and a video screen, the most common of which is a "GameBoy™" video game. The entire video game docks into the apparatus and on-screen images are enhanced by use of a magnifying element and integral control buttons can be manipulated through control knobs or buttons on the game apparatus. In other words, the game apparatus of Kitaue interfaces the entire video game, wherein the video game is a hand-holdable video game with a screen, control buttons and video game software packaged in a single unit.

In contrast to the teachings of Kitaue, the present invention is directed to a controller adapter that couples to a hand-help video game controller such as used with a Sony Playstation™ video game system. The adapter, in accordance with the embodiments of the invention, is configured to manipulate video images on a remote output video screen, such as a computer screen or a television screen by interfacing with a separate controller. Controllers used with the present invention are typically coupled to a video game box or a computer through a power cord which allows the user to move the controller independently from the output video screen. Preferably, the adapter is configured to simulate an activity that is associated with the video game being played. Kitaue fails to teach or suggest an adapter for coupling to a remote video game controller for manipulating images on a separate output video screen, such as currently recited in the independent Claims 1, 5 and 16.

Specifically, the independent Claim 1 is directed to a video game system comprising an output screen and, a video game controller having control buttons for inputting commands to manipulate images on the output screen through a cord (i.e. a remote video game controller). The system further comprises video game software interfacing between the video game controller and the output screen and an interactive video game controller adapter engaged with the video game controller and shaped to simulate the real-life activity emulated by the video game. As stated above, Kitaue fails to teach or suggest a system comprising an adapter for coupling to a remote video game controller that is coupled to an output video screen through a cord. For at least these reasons the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Kitaue.

Claims 2-4 are dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Kitaue. Accordingly, Claims 2-4 are also

allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

5 The independent Claim 5 is directed to a video game input device comprising a video game controller having control buttons for inputting commands to manipulate video game images on an output screen of a video game system through a power cord and an interactive video game controller adapter engaged with the video game controller and being shaped to simulate the real-life activity emulated by the video game. As stated above, Kitaue fails to teach or suggest a video game input device comprising a video game controller having control buttons for inputting commands and manipulating images on an output screen of a video game system through a power cord and an interactive video game controller adapter engaged with the video game controller and shaped to simulate the real-life activity emulated by the video game. For at least these reasons the independent Claim 5 is allowable over the teachings of Kitaue.

10 Claims 6-15 are all dependent on the independent Claim 5. As described above, the independent Claim 5 is allowable over the teachings of Kitaue. Accordingly, Claims 6-15 are also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

15 The independent Claim 16 is directed to an interactive video game controller adapter for engaging with a hand-held video game controller and being shaped to represent the unique characteristics of a video game, the interactive video game controller adapter being configured to manipulate control buttons on the hand-held video game controller through input controls to manipulate images of a video game on a remote screen coupled to the hand-held video game controller. As stated above, Kitaue fails to teach or suggest a controller adapter for engaging with a hand-held video game controller and being shaped to represent the unique characteristics of a video game, the interactive video game controller adapter being configured to manipulate control buttons on the hand-held video game controller through input controls and manipulate images of a video game on a remote screen coupled to the hand-held video game controller. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 16 is allowable over the teachings of Kitaue.

20 Claims 17-21 are all dependent on the independent Claim 16. As described above, the independent Claim 16 is allowable over the teachings of Kitaue. Accordingly, Claims 17-21 are also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

25 **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

30 Within the Office Action, Claims 4 and 8-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,213,327 to Kitaue (hereafter "Kitaue") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,766,077 to Hongo (hereafter "Hongo").

Claim 4 depends from Claim 1 and Claims 8-12 all depend from Claim 5. As stated

above, Claims 1 and 5 are both allowable over the teachings of Kitaue. Accordingly, Claims 4 and 8-12 are all also allowable as being dependent on allowable base Claims.

For the reasons given above, applicant respectfully submit that the Claims 1-21 are now in condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss them so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: 7-8-03

By: Thomas B. Haverstock
Thomas B. Haverstock
Reg. No. 32,571

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.8(a))
I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the:
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP
Date: 7-8-03 By: [Signature]